

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 27, 2010, new claims 27-32 have been added. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, 13-17 and 26 have been canceled. Claims 27-32 are now pending in the application.

In paragraph 8 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In paragraph 10 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the claims. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant has canceled claims 1 and 26 and has added new claims 27-32. Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims do not narrow the scope of the claims, but rather merely clarifies the invention.

In paragraph 12 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, 13-17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shorter.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution has canceled claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, 13-17 and 26 and has added new claims 27-32.

Independent claim 1 sets forth method for processing referenced objects including referencing an object stored on a network for executing a presentation job at a presentation device using a selected indicia, wherein the referencing the object using the selected indicia further consists of selecting only an object name to reference the object, selecting only a globally-unique network object identifier (OID) to reference the object, and selecting the a

globally-unique network OID and a locator to reference the object, determining the object to be found within the network when a resident globally-unique network OID associated with the object is found, generating an error when the object is not found using the object name and when the object is not found in a search of an inline resource group, downloading and capturing the object when the object is located having a globally-unique network OID and a search for a resident object having the globally-unique network OID is unsuccessful and downloading the object without capture when the object is found when referencing only the object name of the object and the object does not have a globally-unique network OID. Independent claim 32 sets forth similar elements.

According to Shorter, each network in a system is assigned a unique “network identifier.” Each data processing system in a network is assigned a unique “host system identifier.” Each object is assigned a unique “object identifier.”

Shorter explicitly states that the three fields 402, 404, and 406 for a particular object identifier 318 uniquely identifies a “single object within a single host data processing system” “within a single network in the system of networks.” Thus, Shorter does not disclose that the identifier is a globally unique identifier. According to Shorter, the identifiers are limited to objects associated with the distributed object computing system.

In addition, Shorter also fails to suggest referencing an object stored on a network for executing a presentation job at a presentation device using an object name to reference the object, only a globally-unique network object identifier (OID) to reference the object, or a globally-unique network OID and a locator to reference the object. Shorter is not concerned with the determination of whether to download and capture certain objects for printing and being able to determine

whether an object has already been stored inline. Further, Shorter fails to suggest a printing system that can determine whether an object that has to be downloaded has been changed.

For example, Shorter does not suggest searching for an object using only an object name and then determining whether the object has a globally unique identifier. Shorter further fails to suggest how to distinguish whether the object should be downloaded and captured or merely downloaded based on whether the object located using only the object name includes a globally unique identifier.

Still further Shorter fails to disclose, teach or suggest that an object that is found within the network having a resident globally-unique network OID associated with the object is identified as being the object being searched for. Shorter also fails to disclose, teach or suggest generating an error when the object is not found using the object name and when the object is not found in a search of an inline resource group.

Shorter does not suggest downloading and capturing the object when the object is located having a globally-unique network OID and a search for a resident object having the globally-unique network OID is unsuccessful. Shorter also fails to suggest downloading the object without capture when the object is found when referencing only the object name of the object and the object does not have a globally-unique network OID.

Shorter merely describes how to assign identifiers that are unique within a closed system. Nevertheless, Shorter does not uniquely identify all downloaded objects to maintain object integrity and capturing downloaded objects in the printer for reuse without additional download time overhead.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 27 and 32 are patentable over Shorter.

Dependent claims 28-31 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 27. Further dependent claims 28-31 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 28-31 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 865-380-5976. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725 for any additional fee required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(865) 380-5976
Date: December 11, 2009



By: 
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204